UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/533,398	03/22/2000	Michael James Taylor	1263.1239	9406

5514 7590 10/26/2005

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER	
RAMAKRISHNAIAH, MELUR	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2643	

DATE MAILED: 10/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/533,398	TAYLOR ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Melur Ramakrishnaiah	2643	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *14 December 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-53* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,7-12,18-20,26-30,36 and 39-53* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *3-6,13-17,21-25,31-35,37 and 38* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *7-10-02, 8-23-02,*. 11-28-03, 9-30-04
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 10, 18, 19, 28, 36, 39, 43, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Natori (EP 0356105) in view of Riegel et al. (DE 019528425C1, hereinafter Riegel).

Regarding claim 1, Natori discloses image processing apparatus, comprising: an image data receiver (2, figs. 3, 5) for receiving image data recorded by plurality of cameras (11, 10, figs. 3, 5) showing movement of plurality of people (fig. 4), a speaker identifier (15, fig. 5) for determining which of the people is speaking (col. 1 lines 27- col. 2, line 1).

Regarding claim 18, Natori discloses image processing apparatus, comprising: an image data receiver (2, figs. 3, 5) for receiving image data recorded by plurality of cameras (11, 10, figs. 3, 5) showing the movements of plurality of people, a speaker identifier (15, fig. 5) for determining which of the people is speaking (col. 1 lines 27- col. 2, line 1).

Regarding claim 19, Natori discloses a method of processing image data recorded by a plurality of cameras showing the movement of plurality of people to select image data for storage, the method comprising: a speaker identification step of determining which of the people is speaking (col. 1 lines 27- col. 2, line 1).

Regarding claim 39, Natori discloses a method of processing image data recorded by a plurality of cameras showing the movement of plurality of people to select image data for storage, the method comprising: a speaker identification step of determining which of the people is speaking (col. 1 lines 27- col. 2, line 1).

Natori differs from claims 1, 18, 19, 39 in that he does not teach the following: determining at whom the speaker is looking, a position calculator for determining the position of the speaker and position of the person at whom the speaker is looking, and a camera selector for selecting image data from the received image on the basis of the determined positions of the speaker and person/object at whom the speaker is looking.

However, Riegel discloses automated stereoscopic camera selection arrangement which teaches the following: determining at whom the speaker (reads on observer) is looking, a position calculator for determining the position of the speaker and position of the person at whom the speaker is looking, and a camera selector for selecting image data from the received image on the basis of the determined positions of the speaker and person/object at whom the speaker is looking (see abstract).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify Natori's system to provide for the following: determining at whom the speaker is looking, a position calculator for determining the position of the speaker and position of the person at whom the speaker is looking, and a camera selector for selecting image data from the received image on the basis of the determined positions of the speaker and person/object at whom the speaker is looking as this arrangement would provide means for selecting the cameras to image the

person/object observer is looking so that user can obtain information about the observed person/object for further use as taught by Riegel.

Regarding claim 36, Natori teaches the following: generating a signal conveying information defining image data selected in the camera selection step (see abstract).

Regarding claims 10 and 28, Notori teaches the following: speaker identifier (15, fig. 5) is arranged to receive speech data from a plurality of microphones each of which is allotted to a respective one of the people, and to determine which of the people is speaking on the basis of the microphone from which data is received (fig. 5 col. 5 lines 31-52).

Regarding claim 43, the combination of Notori and Riegel teaches the following: storing instructions for causing a programmable processing apparatus to become operable to perform a method of any of the claims 19 and 39 as shown above.

3. Claims 2, 7-8, 20, 25-26, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Natori in view of Riegel as applied to claim 1 and 19 above, and further in view of Anderson et al. (US PAT: 5,500,671, hereinafter Anderson).

Regarding claims 2, 20, the combination does not teach the following: camera selector is arranged to select image data in which both the speaker and the person at whom speaker is looking appear.

However, Anderson discloses a video conference system which teaches the following: camera selector (34, fig. 3) is arranged to select image data in which both the speaker and the person at whom speaker is looking appear (col. 4 lines 1-13, col. 2 lines 65-67).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify the combination to provide for the following: camera selector is arranged to select image data in which both the speaker and the person at whom speaker is looking appear as this arrangement would provide more realistic arrangement for video conferees during a video conference so that conferees would have eye contact during the conference as taught by Anderson.

Regarding claims 7-8 and 25-26, the combination does teach the following: speech recipient identifier and the position calculator comprises an image processor for processing the image data from at least one of the cameras to determine whom the speaker is looking, the image processor is arranged to determine the position of each person and at whom each person is looking by processing image data from at least one camera.

However, Anderson teaches the following: speech recipient identifier and the position calculator comprises an image processor for processing the image data from at least one of the cameras to determine whom the speaker is looking, the image processor is arranged to determine the position of each person and at whom each person is looking by processing image data from at least one camera (fig. 6, col. 7, line 27 – col. 8, line 57).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify the combination to provide for the following: speech recipient identifier and the position calculator comprises an image processor for processing the image data from at least one of the cameras to determine whom the

speaker is looking, the image processor is arranged to determine the position of each person and at whom each person is looking by processing image data from at least one camera as this arrangement would facilitate to identify speakers to whom they are speaking, thus promoting eye contact between the speakers.

4. Claims 9 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Natori in view of Riegel and Anderson as applied to claims 7 and 25 above, and further in view of Mann (US PAT: 6,307,526, filed 10-15-1998).

Regarding claims 9 and 27, the combination does not teach the following: image processor is arranged to track the position and orientation of each person's head in three dimensions.

However, Mann wearable camera system which teaches the following: image processor is arranged to track the position and orientation of each person's head in three dimensions (fig. 1, col. 13, line 43 – col. 14, line 10).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify the combination to provide for the following: image processor is arranged to track the position and orientation of each person's head in three dimensions as this arrangement would provide processed video for displaying, thus providing enhanced information to the user as taught by Mann.

5. Claims 11-12, 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Natori in view of Riegel as applied to claims 1 and 19 above, and further in view of Brais et al. (US PAT: 5,995,935, filed 2-4-1997, hereinafter Brais).

Regarding claims 11-12, 29-30, the combination does not teach the following: sound processor for processing sound data defining words spoken by the people to generate text data therefrom in dependence upon the result of the processing performed by the speaker identifier, the sound processor has associated therewith a store for storing respective voice recognition parameters for each of the people, and parameter selector for selecting the voice recognition parameters to be used to process sound data in dependence upon the person determined to be speaking by the identified speaker.

However, Brais discloses report generation system which teaches the following: sound processor for processing sound data defining words spoken by the people to generate text data therefrom in dependence upon the result of the processing performed by the speaker identifier, the sound processor has associated therewith a store for storing respective voice recognition parameters for each of the people, and parameter selector for selecting the voice recognition parameters to be used to process sound data in dependence upon the person determined to be speaking by the identified speaker (col. 9 lines 25-30, col. 12 lines 54-67, col. 13 lines 39-42).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify the combination to provide for the following: sound processor for processing sound data defining words spoken by the people to generate text data therefrom in dependence upon the result of the processing performed by the speaker identifier, the sound processor has associated therewith a store for storing respective voice recognition parameters for each of the people, and parameter selector

for selecting the voice recognition parameters to be used to process sound data in dependence upon the person determined to be speaking by the identified speaker as this arrangement would facilitate archiving information for latter use as taught by Brais, thus providing a record of information for future use.

6. Claims 40, 41-42, 44-45, 46, 48, 50, 52-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ashida et al. (US PAT: 5,206,721, hereinafter Ashida) in view of Riegel.

Regarding claims 40-41, 48, Ashida discloses image processing apparatus, comprising: means (49, fig. 4) for receiving image data recorded by a plurality of cameras (for example 48, fig. 4) showing movement of plurality of people (41-1 ... 41-4, fig. 4), speaker identification means (45, fig. 4) for determining which of the people is speaking (col. 6 lines 20-43; col. 1, line 29 – col. 2, line 30).

Regarding claim 46, Ashida discloses image processing apparatus, comprising: an image data receiver (49, fig. 4) to receive image data picked up by a plurality of cameras (for example 48, fig. 4) showing a plurality of people (41-1 ... 41-4, fig. 4), a speaker identifier (45, fig. 4) operable to determine which of the people is speaking (col. 6 lines 20-43; col. 1, line 29 – col. 2, line 30).

Regarding claim 50, Ashida discloses a method of processing image data by a plurality of cameras showing plurality of people to select image data, the method comprising the steps of: determining which of the people (41-1 ... 41-4, fig. 4) is speaking (col. 6 lines 20-43; col. 1, line 29 – col. 2, line 30).

Ashida differs from claims 40-41, 46, 48, 50 in that he does not teach the following: means for determining at whom the speaker is looking, means for determining the position of the speaker/object and position of the person at whom speaker is looking, and camera selection means for selecting image data from the received image data on the basis of the determined position and person/object at whom the speaker is looking.

However, Riegel teaches the following: means for determining at whom the speaker is looking, means for determining the position of the speaker/object and position of the person at whom speaker is looking, and camera selection means for selecting image data from the received image data on the basis of the determined position and person/object at whom the speaker is looking (fig. 1, abstract).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify Ashida's system to provide for the following: means for determining at whom the speaker is looking, means for determining the position of the speaker/object and position of the person at whom speaker is looking, and camera selection means for selecting image data from the received image data on the basis of the determined position and person/object at whom the speaker is looking as this arrangement would provide means for selecting the cameras to image the person/object observer is looking so that user can obtain information about the observed person/object for further use as taught by Riegel.

Regarding claims 42, 44, 45, 52, 53, the combination of Ashida and Riegel teaches the following: storage device for storing instructions for causing a

programmable apparatus as set out in any one of the claims 39, 40, 41, 50 as shown above.

7. Claims 47, 49, 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ashidain view of Riegel as applied to claims 46, 48, 50 above, and further in view of Anderson.

Regarding claims 47, 49, and 51, the combination does not teach the following: object is a person.

However, Anderson teaches the following: object is a person (col. 2 lines 65-67).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify Ashida's system to provide for the following: object is a person as this arrangement would provide more realistic arrangement for video conferees during a video conference so that conferees would have eye contact during the conference as taught by Anderson.

8. Claims 3-6, 13-17, 21-24, 31-35, 37-38 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Melur Ramakrishnaiah whose telephone number is (571)272-8098. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 Hr schedule.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Curt Kuntz can be reached on (571) 272-7499. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Melur Ramakrishnaiah
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2643